
BARCELONA – ccNSO: Council Meeting
Wednesday, October 24, 2018 – 17:00 to 18:30 CEST
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

KATRINA SATAKI:

Okay, good afternoon. We are about to start our ccNSO Council Public Session here in Barcelona, ICANN63, 5:00 PM local time. So, do we have any apologies? Nope. Any remote participants? No. And I believe we are quorate so we can move forward. Excellent.

In front of you, you have a printed agenda and draft resolution. Also you can see in front you on the screen. First part is the consent agenda. So including resolutions proposed under Item 4, it is a call for volunteers for additional members to the ccNSO Meetings Program Committee and Guidelines Review Committee. We're in a constant need for volunteers.

Then Item 5 which is appointment to replace Christelle Vaval, which unfortunately steps down after this meeting to Triage Committee and ccNSO Travel Funding Committees. And proposals are to appoint Abdalla as a member to the Triage Committee. And after she has taken her seat on the Council, Laura, she will take seat right after this meeting to the ccNSO Travel Funding Committee. Those are two proposals.

Then 6, this is about the participation in Leadership Program a few days before Kobe. So we ask Monday the chair and vice-chairs to select two suitable candidates – one from council and one from

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

working group or committee chairs to make sure that they can learn more about the environment in which they are working.

And then under agenda Item #7, we have another draft resolution which is the three – we'd like to express our interest to participate in the ICANN Academy Chairing Skills Program. Again, we request on Monday chair and vice chairs to select two suitable candidates, one from council and one from working group chairs. So this is something that helps people to develop their chairing skills.

Okay. So those are resolutions proposed as a consent agenda without any much discussion. Anything else? Anyone would like to move?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Move.

KATRINA SATAKI: Stephen moves. And Byron seconds. Thank you very much. So, may I ask for a vote? Everyone who is in favor, please raise your hands. Thank you. I cannot see properly but I think it was unanimous votes. Okay. Thank you very much.

Okay. Then let's move forward. Action Items. So you see all action items, majority of them are completed. One of the action items is still ongoing. As we're really trying to get as many councilors to participate in each call as possible, it's really great if we can avoid any conflicts – really major conflicts – for regions and meetings of regional organizations as one of those stoppers that very often does not allow

councilors to participate in the calls. May I ask regional organizations to be more active and tell us whenever they spot a conflict with the call.

Okay. Let's move forward then. We had two intersessional decisions. We selected members to IANA Functions Review Team and submitted a statement on the initial report on Work Track 1-4 from GNSO Subsequent Procedures of PDP.

What else do we have? Okay. Agenda Item #8. It's the Update on Council Elections. So I think by now we all know that in Europe we're going to have elections. In other regions, we have one candidate so they will take their seats after our first meeting next year after Kobe meeting. I mean the new councilors. Of course, those who continue their work, they will basically just continue working on the council.

Okay. Then agenda Item #9: Update on our PDP. Thank you very much. That was a very great update. I do not think we need to listen to it again.

Then we also had updates from CSC, RZERC and Empowered Community and administration. Again, also from the meeting. Again, thank you very much for those updates.

We also had updates from our working groups and written updates from liaisons. So that's all about Consent agenda where we do not envision any discussions.

Regular Meeting. agenda Item #13. It is about recommendations from Work Stream 2. Recommendations and next steps. So you all heard

several times, for many years now we've listened to reports from Work Stream 2 and, yeah, they have completed their monumental work and they've come up with recommendations and now they ask us as one of their chartering organizations to look into these recommendations and to approve them.

Today we took the temperature in the room, and those ccTLDs present, they were in support of these recommendations, in adoptions of these recommendations. So, basically, who would like to move?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Move.

KATRINA SATAKI: Move, Pablo. Thank you very much. Abibu seconded. So, great. Any comments on the resolution or on ... I just want to say that in this case, we propose to follow the same pattern that we did with Work Stream 1. What we did we discussed, we sensed the temperature in the room, the council took the decision and we wait for seven days to see if those members who were not in the room also support the adoption of these recommendations. So that is the plan here. Young Eum, please.

YOUNG EUM LEE: Thank you, Katrina. I might be looking ahead but under Item 13, we have a 13.2 that mandates the GRC to work on the implementation. Is it time to discuss that also?

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, I was thinking about taking one step at a time but if you want, we can move to next decision too. Yes, of course, we can discuss that too because clearly if we approve recommendations, we will need to implement them. Yes, Young Eum?

YOUNG EUM LEE: Well, I was just wondering if we could have maybe a summary of the activity that we conducted today so that it would give the GRC a guide.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, of course. Everything that was written on the flip charts has been captured, sent already to Jordan, me, and I don't remember who else but ... Bernie, yeah. So, yes, we are ready. Actually, I think that we can already ... It's safe to announce that Bernie will help us with this work. Is it? No, not safe yet? No?

BART BOSWINKEL: Unless he's volunteering.

KATRINA SATAKI: Of course, he loves our community. Okay. We hope on strong support from the staff as well.

So, anything else? Both of these decisions, 13.1 and 13.2. No more comments? Then may I ask for a vote? Everyone who is in favor of

adoption of recommendations from Work Stream 2, please raise your hands.

BART BOSWINKEL: It's unanimous.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Now supports the idea that we task the Guidelines Review Committee to review and implement those recommendations with respect to diversity and SO/AC accountability regardless of the fact whether the final report is or not adopted by the board or another SO/AC.

Do you want to say something? Oh, you're voting. Okay. Do you want to say something? No, we're not looking because apparently Young Eum suggested and we discussed both [inaudible]. Not yet, no. We voted on the first one. Now I'm asking, who is favor of tasking the GRC with this work? Please raise your hand.

BART BOSWINKEL: Unanimous.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Then next one is actually pretty tough. We've been pushing this agenda item around for some time now, and it's about the amended charter of the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance. As you may remember we asked them several

questions. No, actually, let's go one step back. The GNSO noted that the format in which this working group operates does not correspond to requirements set for Cross-Community Working Group. So in the essence, that group is not a Cross-Community Working Group. Therefore, they stepped out from this group because it was okay for them to be one of the charting organizations of this working group.

The working group took that on board and proposed to be renamed or restructured into something else, into Engagement Group on Internet Governance. And they submitted their updated charter. We reviewed it and we asked several questions – actually, we asked several questions then there was the new charter and then we asked a few more questions. We received answers and ever since we were thinking what to do.

Here during this meeting, we had our bilateral meetings with ALAC and the board today. During these meetings we tried to sense how they feel about ICANN's activities with respect to Internet governance and how to coordinate the work that have been undertaken by different groups within ICANN including ICANN org, the board, and the community.

Well, from the today's discussion with the board – actually, from all the discussions that we've had – it's clear that ccTLDs, they are concerned about Internet governance. They clearly participate on their own. They discuss all those issues, but at the same time we also see that for some reason, ccTLDs are not active participants of this Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance.

It'd be interesting to understand first, what is the reason why? Second, since there is clear interest on these issues, how can we meet the needs and interest of ccTLDs? Is this working group the right format? I don't know. Today, actually, we had very interesting suggestions from the board members on how to do that.

So, I'd like to open the discussion on this. I see Young Eum already has something to say. By the way, she is our most active representative on this Cross-Community Working Group. Young Eum.

YOUNG EUM LEE:

Because it's not chartered yet. I'm just wondering if anybody else has opinions before I try to barrage you with my opinions.

KATRINA SATAKI:

One thing that does worry me personally – I already said that during our meeting with the board. When we had these discussions with the group, at least what I understood was that they already have support from Nigel Hickson. They were very happy with that. They were very happy with this collaboration. So they did not ask for any additional funds. As far as I understand from the discussion that representatives of the group had with the GNSO Council, it looks like they expect the chartering organizations will put in some staff efforts into the work, which is unfortunate. At this moment, we're absolutely unable to do that because if we do it, it means that we have to stop some of our other activities. That's one of my main concerns.

What was interesting from today's discussion was that when Göran, for example, suggested that we give him some brief – sorry? Yeah, top priorities when we talk about ... we give him something about ccTLDs that he could share during these meetings at various Internet Governance Fora. So, there is a need to coordinate and actually today when I was listening to all these discussions, maybe we can have something that we ... when we summarize, for example. Right now there's going to be an Internet Governance Forum in Paris. What if we had a wiki space or something where we list all those ccTLDs that are going and so they can share their experience where they're going to participate, where they need some support from other ccTLDs who are going to participate or something like that?

Okay. One thing, if we see ourselves in this engagement group then how can we make most out of it? That's one thing. If we do not see ourselves but still recognize the need to be active in the field of Internet governance, how can we coordinate our actions and what tools can we use to make this exchange really valuable and useful for our community?

So those were my 5 cents or maybe 25. Young Eum?

YOUNG EUM LEE:

Okay. I think I can take it from there. I think with regard to the subject of Internet governance, it is a very important subject that basically may have the ability to even threaten the Internet governance that ICANN is involved in today, and that is because of the power that the government have through ITU or UN. And that is a real threat because

there is constant efforts within the ITU and the UN among others to enable the governments to have a stronger voice in the business of Internet governance because internet is so important to all the countries. And so I think there is agreement there that ICANN also needs to be doing something.

However, since the recession in 2005 and with the sort of the urgency that we felt back in 2012 with WCIT, and then with the certain incident, NETmundial in 2014, that's when interest in Internet governance peaked and that's when many people actually participated. Now the threat or the forces are not as strong as they were back in 2012 but the forces are still there and those forces are something that the ICANN really needs to be concerned about and to keep a watchful eye on. That is why ICANN is participating in the IGFs and so on.

The question is how do we deal with this within ICANN? Because considering the more important day-to-day activities that are related with the ccs, the issue of global Internet governance itself really doesn't have an immediate sort of urgency to many of the ccs. That is why the group has proposed to form not a CCWG but a CCEG.

Within ICANN I know the CCWGs and these working groups have great weight in that there is this feeling that these working groups are dealing with very important stuff – policies that have the potential to influence what's going on in the various SOs and the ACs. From having participated in these groups since 2013, the feeling of this group is that there needs to be some kind of a community effort, sort of mechanism that we can present to the organizations outside ICANN

that show that this is really a multistakeholder and a community-led effort. That is why the discussion or the need or even the request for it being a chartered organization keeps being presented to the SOs. But the word “charter” doesn’t mean within the CCEG that anything that the group does has any kind of an influence on what goes on in the ccs or the gs that the members – most of the members I should say – of the group is trying to gain something out of it. That’s not the feeling that I get. I get the feeling that there is a very strong feeling within the members that this issue is very important and that when we presented, when we go to the IGF, for example, it’s not just the staff, it’s not just the CEO, it’s the Internet governance community supported group that is presenting the views. Basically, that looks much better.

So then if we move on to the question of, “How do we deal with this?” we can decide to charter the CCEG, not the CCWG, sort of engagement group with a much looser relationship, mental support basically. But then the other thing is that many of the cc members – actually, I saw that many of us raise their hands when you asked how many were involved in the governance activities. And so those people actually need to come to the meetings. There is a public meeting tomorrow morning.

I don’t know. We can either decide that we are going to – I don’t know. Not maybe use the word “charter” but use a much looser word – sympathy or the support that we feel for this group and maybe not make it as formal as a group. I think this is something that we do need to get involved in at least partially. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. As I remember, one of the key elements of this group was that they monitor whatever is going on and they alert ICANN community when something is worth to look into.

A couple of months ago I received – I’m not allowed to disclose the source – but I received a couple of resolutions from the upcoming ITU Plenipot which were very closely related to ccTLDs. They were about ccTLDs, basically. Never heard anything from that group, which was act the one who was supposed to alert us.

Has the group delivered in the past? Yes or no? Well, I have a feeling that they might have been working very hard somewhere in the background, in the shadows, but we haven’t felt that. At least that’s my feeling. I don’t know if ... I see people nodding.

Again, recognizing the need to be part of these Internet governance discussions. So, maybe there’s a way that we form something within the ccNSO and then we can liaise with the group. But if there are other suggestions, really, we’d like to hear. Giovanni, please.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Hi, Ktrina. Thank you. My point is more about the ICANN involvement in the Internet governance. As I personally still fail to understand how they are getting involved in the various Internet Governance Forums at national and international level. Personally, I keep seeing a very unstructured approach which is detrimental to the message they may [like] to the leader. And I’m saying that because recently ICANN has

been engaging with some national IGF but not with others. I'd like to understand why. I ask some people at ICANN, including the European region. I have not received an answer or at least an answer I believe it's a decent answer especially from an organization that should have a certain role in the Internet ecosystem.

So I think that this engagement in this Internet governance is something that at one hand is true that Göran is waiting for us to produce something so that it can have some literature at hand whenever it's engaged in dialogue. I don't think, honestly, we should produce this literature. I think that ICANN has sufficient materials and some stuff to have this literature produced internally. We may be requested to help and provide input once the first draft is produced. But certainly we have been in the environment for so many years and been asked that we produce literature – I think there should be a coordination role.

So, my personal take is that it's quite tricky and challenging to determine out to engage further in the Internet governance process, both because again I failed to see a structured approach at ICANN side and also because I believe that Internet governance is such a broad area with so many different areas. You can talk about net neutrality, you can talk about human rights, you can talk about Internet of Things. So it's quite difficult to understand also how ccs can contribute because it could be ccTLDs more interested in one of these areas like net neutrality. Because at national level, they've been involved for one reason or another in that area, but ICANN is not interested. Or there might be some others, they are more into Internet

of Things or some others are more in human rights. It's really so different that having somebody representing the cc community is a big challenge. And also this person should have to be fully devoted because at some point if this person is representing the cc, this person should have the duty to consult the cc community before expressing some views on that specific matter. So it's really a big thing. So personally, I don't see how the ccNSO can be engaged in such working group.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. Before we go any further, let's summarize. In what you said, I see two things. One thing is that maybe we can ask a set of questions addressed to ICANN org as how much they spend, where they go, what message they deliver. No, that's one thing. No. That's my understanding that that's the question that you would like to hear. That's probably something that's an answer to the question we ask to the board, what community could do differently and this could be a different approach maybe. That's one thing.

And second thing is about what – I'm not sure that ccNSO should do something but we are a global forum where we all come together so we can provide a platform to share information. That's not saying that we should go somewhere and represent all ccTLDs – we can't do that. But we certainly can help to exchange information. Pablo?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ:

I would like to pick up on two subjects, on two issues. Giovanni, you brought up a very good point. If we are to take one person, that one person would have to be devoted to take this tremendous monumental load, which seems very impractical.

To the point that Katrina brings which is, is ccNSO the best platform to do this? I've been thinking about this for a while and I have been talking to a regional organization LACTLD and I have been engaging to some of the members of our brother organization AfriTLD, and it seems to me that the one thing that we are as councilors can do is to go back to our regional organizations, bring these ideas and concerns, and start working at the most elemental level, just reach out to each ccTLD within our regional organizations, help out to bring these ideas. Sometimes some of them are very busy and engaged in their day-to-day tasks and are not aware that these discussions are taking place. I'm not saying that there is lack of knowledge for everybody but some of them are. That would also help as a form of outreach by engaging these people. Are you aware that this is happening? Do you think that you could help out in this? And then instead of a "trickle down" effect, it would be a "trickle up" effect because it would be from the ccTLD to the regional organization, from the regional organization to the ccNSO and then this could be the platform that can speak to the board and to others. I put this as a suggestion.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you, Pablo. Before I move to the other side, sorry, Giovanni, I didn't let you comment on –

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: I think more or less you captured what I was saying and summarize it. So I think it would be nice to have sort of an overview of what are the initiatives and engagement ICANN is having in the Internet governance. I think as a very practical compromise, we could make the effort and appoint one person but not as the repository of all the perspectives of ccTLD but a person that could be the contact point for ICANN staff engaged in Internet governance dialogue to have the cc perspective and this person could be the sort of liaison between the council, the ccTLD community and ICANN staff engaged in Internet governance dialogue.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Byron?

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks. First, on question pertaining to Young Eum's concerns. As somebody who's been a fellow traveler in the Internet governance space for a long time, I recognize that the comment she makes about the issues that are in front of us or in front of this community are absolutely true and valid particularly with the Plenipot happening shortly and text and language that finds its way into documents that would be and should be of concern to us, what do we do about that? And I think, however, as individual ccns, we have a responsibility to pay attention for our own individual selfish self-interest as ccns, we must manage our own risks and we must therefore be aware of the risks and

it's one place that you can see them. And depending on our relationships with government, we might do it in concert with our governments.

So, I'm very sympathetic to the issue that Young Eum raises but I'm equally sort of I'm unsure that we in this community are the right environment to proactively address it as a community, in that there are very different types of ccs in here. We share many similarities. We all do essentially a similar thing. However, there are many different views on how we should conduct ourselves in the bigger, broader world. I mean we heard it today just on funding. I think we should pay for services. Leonid wants it for free. I mean there are very, very different perspectives. I'm not putting a value judgment on them. They're just different perspectives based on where we come from, how we're individually governed, etc.

So I'm not sure that we collectively are the right space for a push message or representative message into the Internet governance ecosystem, but I think where there may be opportunity for us is as an information facilitator for the community because there's so many Internet governance-related things happening. Even for those who pay attention, it's hard to keep track of them all. But maybe there's a consolidation or facilitation opportunity for this community to make sure that the information is available easily and in one place for our community just as a constructive suggestion and not as make work project because I know other entities actually do this. If you go on the ICANN Calendar, as simple as that, I would argue that probably most Internet governance-related activities are already there, color coded

for your ease. So if you want to go to the Fourth Annual Armenian Internet Governance Forum, it's right there – dates, places, obviously the Plenipot is there and all other related Internet governance-related issues. So maybe there's a way to make that easy – easier for us or ISOC has a similar thing. But maybe we're the convener and consolidator of information. That's the role of ccNSO can play, not as a push role through a formal working group or any other kind of group.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. Young Eum?

YOUNG EUM LEE:

Yes, I would like to actually clarify a bit what the group has been involved with for the past four or five years. Basically, just the term Internet governance means a lot of things. But basically, the group has been most concerned with ensuring the fact that ICANN remains the sole manager of the unique identifiers that we're all very concerned with the group. And so the outside activities of the group basically mostly involved sort of a defensive position, not an offensive position at all. And because the group is most interested in the issue of unique identifiers, the most attention has been given to the ITU Plenipots and the various meetings that lead to the ITU Plenipot and several meetings that stem from the Plenipot. And so it's not the group doesn't aim to engage in a whole lot of stuff and doesn't ask the ccs to give a lot of time to it but just – as I said, basically a general support from the community is I think what the group is seeking.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. Any more comments? So if not, then let me summarize what my sense is from this discussion. The first, we decided not to participate in the engagement group as a chartering organization. Nevertheless, the thing that we can appoint IG liaison from one of the councilors who could be the contact point for the group and other ICANN communities including the board or ICANN org to be contacted whenever there's a need to provide some input from the ccNSO Council and then we can think about the ways to exchange information about all these events. Yeah, they are in the calendar already but if we could somehow foster collaboration of ccTLDs who are attending these events would also be an added value.

Have I summarized this correctly? If so, then maybe let's do it that way. We will ask the Secretariat to draft resolution and send it to the council list so you can all see to suggest edits and at the end we can have an online vote. Does this sound okay? I see no objections, then let's move forward.

Next that we have, agenda Item #15. It's about establishment of the ccNSO Onboarding Mentor/Mentee Committee. Basically, again we've discussed this several times. There's this new approach to fellowship program ... no. This is onboarding. You know what, I keep mixing them all. It's good that we have Alejandra and Margarita who can tell them both apart.

It's about this ICANN Mentor Program. We discussed that on Sunday. There's increasing role for mentors, and those mentors are expected

to dedicate a lot of time to coach. Newcomers coach people from the community. In our case, those should be ccTLDs. Here we have a proposal to have this committee. Our decision says that we request the ccNSO Secretariat and Alejandra and Margarita to draft Terms of Reference for our ccNSO Mentor/Mentee Committee and then this committee will be expected to develop main activities and identify them and present to the next council meeting.

Anyone would like to move? Margarita moved. Seconders, Pablo, thank you. Maybe we can have these movers on duty. We decide at the beginning of the meeting on the mover on duty and seconder on duty and then we can just move forward.

Okay, anyone would like to say something? Margarita? Alejandra? No? Nothing? If no other comments, then let's vote. Everyone who is in favor, please raise your hand.

BART BOSWINKEL: Unanimous.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Resolution paused.

Next one, Nomination for the Fellowship Program with Mentors. So we have to defer it.

Then a very joyful event, we have a new ccNSO membership application from .td. It's from Chad. It's a very short country name and ch is taken, ca is taken. Yeah, so .td. We have an application from

them. We have followed the usual procedure. No outstanding issues. Who would like to move? Okay. Everybody moves and everybody seconds, so thank you very much. You can choose whatever you want.

Okay, I'm not sure if we have any discussions here. No? No discussions? Thank you. Then let's vote. Everyone who is in favor, please raise your hands.

BART BOSWINKEL: Unanimous.

KATRINA SATAKI: Unanimous. Great. Welcome, .td.

Council Updates. Any updates? No updates? Any updates from the Secretariat? No. None. Thank you.

Then we have two items under Any Other Business submitted by Stephen. Stephen, please.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Actually, I consolidated it into a single item. As you guys know, I sent out an e-mail a little while ago suggesting that we based on observations from the PDP working Group that I discussed yesterday and the extreme difficulty we are having trying to find a non-ccNSO member that Katrina explained earlier today that we set up a working group to read through the bylaws and find what I would consider the nonsense stuff that got left behind in the [sausage] making that was

the bylaw creation process. I submit we have an issue with 10.1(a), we have an issue with 10.1(f). We have the non-ccNSO member requirement – and I can't remember what article that is in – but I think we should start maintaining, if not start a working group – or not a working group but just some sort of informal thing – is we can just start each of us keeping a list. The council as a whole keeps a list of things as we find them. I would like that approach instead of, "Oh, we just found this. Let's get the board to fix this." And then a little bit later it's like, "Oh, we found that. Let's get the board to fix that." This is with my ECA admin had on now because at the end of the day, I'd like to see a single board resolution involving standard bylaw changes triggering a single Rejection Action Petition Period rather than 15 or 20 board actions fixing one little thing at a time, each of which would require a Rejection Action Petition Period and possible forum. But it's apparent and other SOs/ACs – I know the GNSO had one thing fixed already which did trigger Rejection Action Petition Period a couple of meetings ago, but my feeling is we really should – and I think it's timely to do this in conjunction with the review that's getting underway – identify areas in the bylaw that we think need repair or scrapping.

I'm not quite sure how to proceed on this except I just want to make people aware that we do have an issue here. I think it's important with regards to the review coming up that we be proactive in identifying areas that we may be implicitly out of compliance on because they make no sense or requirements that simply cannot be met. Thoughts on this from anyone else?

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Stephen. This is very important issue that you're raising. Anyone would like to say something? Yeah, Byron, please.

BYRON HOLLAND: I think Stephen's entirely correct and we should do this work.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. I think that's the right approach to try to summarize all the things that need to be changed. Nevertheless, I'm not very optimistic. I'm sure that we will leave one or two out and we will need to fix them later but at least we can try.

Yes, Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: If we can achieve the 90/10 rule, I'd be happy with that. Given that I've been neck deep in this stuff for a while, I'd be happy to take the [blame] and be the list maintainer.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. In addition to all your duties and responsibilities so far, so you're volunteering?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: It was nicely into the ECA work already. So incrementally, it's pretty small.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. I think we're happy with that especially because I see that people are happy that ... no one expects them to do it. So thank you very much, Stephen. Let's agree on that. Anything else? No? Nothing else. Okay, thank you very much.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: When you're reading the bylaws over the holidays, I encourage council members to drop me an e-mail if anything they find that looks a little funky because I know you'll all be reading them over the holiday season.

KATRINA SATAKI: No, no. Right before going to bed.

Any Other Business. Anyone would like to raise anything? No?

Then next agenda item is Next Meeting. We have next call on 15 of November at 11:00 UTC and 13 December at 17:00 UTC.

Then we have a very nice agenda item. It's called "Thank You and Welcome." Okay, before we start thanking people, Byron wants to raise an issue.

BYRON HOLLAND: It was just on the last agenda item and you were too quick for me. I just want to recognize that November 15 I think is the last day of the IGF. So I just recognize that for some people who are traveling in and out of the IGF –

KATRINA SATAKI: You see, we need to coordinate these things. We do need –

BYRON HOLLAND: It's just that it's something to note. That's all.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. Thank you very much. Probably we should look into this.

Okay, I'm now back to thanking people. First, we already thanked Mike Silber for his nine-year service to the community on the ICANN Board. So thank you very much, Mike.

We'd like to thank Christelle for her hard work on the ccNSO Council as a NomCom nominee. Wait a minute. Thank you very much.

Okay, next we'd like to thank Red.es, our local host, for their hospitality, for all their help and all their warmth that we felt here. So thank you very much.

We also would like to thank [Yurid] for their beautiful evening, for wonderful ccNSO dinner, for fantastic opportunity to move a little bit after a day of long sitting. So thank you very much, [Yurid].

We would also like to welcome our new councilors. We have two NomCom appointed councilors, it's Laura Margolis and Ajay Data.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Let me see you, Laura. Get up. There you go.

KATRINA SATAKI: Also I need to add that Ajay has been appointed for two years and Laura for three years. So, thank you.

Okay. So who else do we need to thank? Okay, of course we have to thank all the participants. We need to thank support staff. We need to thank Secretariat who helped us. Thanks a lot to the councilors, to the Meeting Program Working Group, and to everyone who made this possible.

Young Eum, please.

YOUNG EUM LEE: Yes, actually I especially would like to thank Joke for her excellent pre-summary of the meeting, which was very helpful. She has been doing that for the past couple of meetings and I really appreciate that. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Thanks to all remote participants. Thanks to everyone, especially to –

Okay. You're tired of me. Let's close the meeting. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]